

Global Dignity: What Is It? How Do We Achieve It?

Evelin Lindner

MD, Psychologist, Dr psychol, Dr med

April 2014

Thailand, Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies,

www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php

This paper has been published in two parts in the *Journal of Urban Culture Research*, Volume 8 and 9, 2014, “Arts and Social Outreach – Designs for Urban Dignity,” published by the Faculty of Fine and Applied Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, jointly with Osaka City University, Japan:

1. “Urban Dignity - Global Dignity: What Is It? How Do we Achieve It?” (Part 1 in Volume 8, http://cujucr.com/downloads/JUCR_Vol8_2014-F.pdf#page=9)
2. “Urban Dignity - Global Dignity: What Is It? How Do we Achieve It?” (Part 2 in Volume 9, http://cujucr.com/downloads/JUCR_Vol9_2014-F.pdf#page=9)

This paper summarises two presentations:

1. ‘Urban Dignity: What Is It? How Do We Achieve It?’
Presentation given at the 12th Urban Culture Forum, ‘Arts and Social Outreach - Designs for Urban Dignity’ organised by the Urban Research Plaza, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, 3rd - 4th March 2014, convened by Kjell Skjellstad. Evelin Lindner gave a brief overview over her work on dignity on 4th March 2014. The video was recorded by Deeyah Khan. Please note that due to technical issues, this presentation could not be given in its full length and that the video is unedited. See <http://youtu.be/Vh0ZSRzzfDY> and www.urp.faa.chula.ac.th/urp/Forum.html.
2. ‘Global Dignity’
Presentation given at the 23rd Annual Conference of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, ‘Returning Dignity’, that took place at Chiang Mai University, Northern Thailand, 8-12th March 2014, inspired by Kjell Skjellstad and convened by Chayan Vaddhanaphuti, Professor and Founding Director of the Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development (RSCD) and Director of the Center of Ethnic Studies and Development (CESD) at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University. Evelin Lindner gave a brief overview over her work on dignity on 12th March 2014. The video was recorded by Donna Fujimoto. Please note that this video is unedited. See youtu.be/4H-wB9f0jO8 and www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/annualmeeting/23.php.

A Dual Call for Papers had been issued for The Urban Research Plaza’s 12th Urban Culture Forum, and for the *Journal of Urban Culture Research*. Presentations were invited spanning the wide and diverse field of urban culture. The questions below were offered as evocative guidelines rather than requirements:

How can we open the world of art for all (children, youth, elderly, disabled, disadvantaged)?
How can we promote artistic expressions of minority groups? What are the means of enlarging participation in artistic activities among urban populations? How can art

stimulate and promote citizens interaction in urban planning and design? How can art activism confront urban patterns of gender inequality and humiliating practices? How can the artist community contribute to solving urban conflicts and restoring human dignity? What allows traditional cultures and values to survive? How can artists contribute to the preservation of national art treasures? What measures can be taken to promote cultural continuity in urban environments? What is the place of arts education in promoting social and environmental awareness? In short: How can we promote art for social dignity?

Abstract

Unity in diversity is at the centre of dignity. It means that people of all classes and colours intermingle in a spirit of mutual care and respect. Traditionally, throughout the past millennia, *uniformity in division* has been practised almost everywhere on the planet: to strengthen their competitive advantage over enemy out-groups, in-groups maintained a strictly unequal domination of *higher* beings over *lesser* beings. Unity in diversity is a more complex concept as it requires the readiness and ability to consider everyone else as equal in dignity, and it calls for the skills to enter into dialogue with equals. As long as such a culture is not yet established, unity in diversity has the potential to trigger uneasiness, including feelings of humiliation, and can lead to attempts to cleanse and exclude diversity so as to return to the more familiar and less complex experience of uniformity in division. Urban contexts are prime experimental laboratories for this transition. For urban dignity to flourish and social and ecological sustainability to emerge, interdisciplinary dialogue is needed to overcome the traditional practise of domination over people and over nature. Urban dignity flourishes when the city is regarded in terms of a family that collaborates in mutual communal sharing and stewardship of their environment, while urban dignity collapses when priority is given to clambering for power and status, be it through overt oppression or cloaked as economic necessity. Artists can play a central role in creating conditions for social interactions of dignity instead of humiliation. Music, for instance, has the power to unite. One example was given by Oslo citizens when they reacted to the 22 July 2011 terror attacks in Norway by gathering in front of the courthouse singing ‘The Rainbow People’.

Contents

Global plundering	7
Global family building	12
Global unity in diversity	19
Global citizenship of dignity and care: a personal practice.....	22
What is needed?.....	27
Reference List.....	28

Introduction

At the 12th Urban Culture Forum at Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok, a group of doctoral students presented a fascinating project titled ‘The Resonance of Reasons from the Streets of Bangkok’. This presentation documented the high sense of responsibility among protesters in Bangkok, responsibility not just for oneself and one’s family, but for Thailand as a whole.

When I gave my talk the next day, I began by asking the audience: ‘How many of you feel a responsibility for your family and for Thailand?’ And then I asked: ‘How many of you feel a responsibility for our planet with all its people and animals?’ Almost everyone raised their hands.

With these questions I placed a value choice at the outset of my lecture. I did this to counter the trend in contemporary academia to obscure value choices by bypassing them. I

agree with Kjell Skjellstad, the convener of this conference, that present-day social sciences need to revive their responsibility, which is to think critically (see Habermas, 1973).

What is at stake? At stake is the *scope of justice*, or the reach of morals: ‘Individuals or groups within our moral boundaries are seen as deserving of the same fair, moral treatment as we deserve. Individuals or groups outside these boundaries are seen as undeserving of this same treatment’ (Coleman, 2000, p. 118). I highly appreciate that the students’ care about society at large, not just about their own career. I admire that they make their research relevant to society. Likewise, I admire the courage of another group of doctoral students who problematized the role of sexuality in society. Their presentation was titled ‘Wall of Sex’. The choice of this topic was so extraordinary that the following note was attached to it in the programme: ‘this important presentation deals with & displays mature subject matter that may be offensive to some; viewer discretion is advised’. In our conference in Chiang Mai, it was researcher Patchanee Malikhao who spoke on a related theme, on ‘Culture, Religion, and HIV/Aids in Thailand’. See also her book *Sex in the Village: Culture, Religion and HIV/AIDS in Thailand*, Malikhao, 2011.

With my question about global responsibility I intended to convey two messages, first, that it is possible to widen the scope of justice from the personal to the national and to the global level, and, second, that the shouldering of global responsibility is what is needed most when the local is captive to global pressures.

The call for global responsibility comes from all continents. Another way to name it is *transformation by enlargement*. Catherine Odora Hoppers holds the South African Research Chair in Development Education at the University of South Africa in Pretoria. She is originally from Uganda, where she supported Milton Obote and his vision for Africa. She calls for the ‘enlargement from Africa to humanity’. Transformation by enlargement, in her view, means that ‘all key concepts and ideas driving or anchoring policy and the academy are revisited with a view to expanding their understanding to include ways of seeing that had been preciously excluded. These include the information society/ knowledge economy, AND innovation, two central themes that underpin policy discourses in higher education, science, research and innovation from the perspective of human development, and especially the marginalized’ (*Report of the 4th Retreat Development Education and Systems Transformation: Transformation by Enlargement: From Africa to Humanity!* Held 19–30th November 2011, Pretoria, South Africa, p. 4).

We hear a similar call also from South America. Here it has yet another name, namely, *organisational level of awareness*. Clodomir de Moraes was less known than his colleague Paulo Freire, however, perhaps his contribution is even more important:

De Moraes, in contradistinction to Freire, sets forward not two but three levels of awareness. He adds to Freire’s two, which are: the naïve level and the critical level. The third is the organisational level of awareness. At the naïve level a person is aware of problems but is unable to understand their cause (and so may blame God or the Fates). The critically conscious person is able to identify the factors responsible for problems, and their inter-relationship. Organisational awareness is reached when the person has the ability to act together with others to address a problem or attain particular results. Organisational awareness manifests what de Moraes calls a ‘methodological rationality’. This distinction between Freire’s ‘critical consciousness’ and de Moraes’s ‘organizational consciousness’ has already been discussed above in Chapter Three (Andersson, 2013, chapter IV, p. 15, unpublished manuscript).

Why is it so important for us, the human family on planet Earth, to enlarge our awareness to global levels, to take responsibility for our global affairs, in addition to our local affairs?

Catherine Odora Hoppers shared the image displayed further down when we worked together in Pretoria in South Africa in May 2013. It shows the mouth of a crocodile, waiting to eat all, both the winners and the losers in local struggles. The picture invites viewers to lift their eyes from the local to the global level, since the crocodile operates at the global level. Odora Hopper's message is that it is unwise to concentrate on local matters while overlooking that the crocodile is ready to eat us all.

Odora Hoppers would agree with French wartime resistance hero Stéphane Frédéric Hessel, who cried out *Indignez vous!* (Hessel, 2010). He called on people to 'cry out against the complicity between politicians and economic and financial powers' and to 'defend our democratic rights'.



Picture 1, by Catherine Odora Hoppers

Future generations may call our era 'the dark era of absurdities'. 'Business as usual' is utopian in our times. What many belittle as idealism—noble but irrelevant—increasingly emerges to be the only realism. Ever more people believe that a 'great transition' is needed, more than mere business as usual limping along with the help of some reforms (Raskin, 2012, Lindner, 2012a). Political economist Gar Alperovitz has worked for better regulations for decades; now his verdict is that deeper change is needed. After decades of experimenting with reform, his verdict is that instability and inequality is not a short-term aberration but the long-term consequence of the essence of our current economic arrangements (Alperovitz, 2009).

The notion of sustainability entails two core aspects, a social and an ecological aspect. The social aspect pertains to what we do to each other, whether we create peace or war, while the ecological aspect stands for what we do with our natural environment.

There is veritable progress with respect to social sustainability. New and important human rights conventions have been adopted. Many human rights defenders work extremely hard and have grown to become a real challenge to power. Predictably, however, power fights back. 'The space for human rights defenders to act and participate openly and actively in the society is reduced (Dahle, 2008, p. 2). 'As civil society groups have become more sophisticated and effective in their advocacy efforts, many governments have also become more sophisticated in responding to their critics' (Dahle, 2011, p. 2). Even worse, as the Human Rights House

Foundation in Oslo reports, throughout the past years, it has become increasingly difficult and even dangerous to be a human rights defender. And if we posit that peace means disarmament, then the balance is even more negative: The volume of international sales of conventional weapons has risen by 17 per cent in the period 2008–2012 as compared to the period 2003–2007 (SIPRI, 2013, www.sipri.org).

As to ecological sustainability, or what we do to our habitat, plundering the resources of our planet looks like a clever strategy to be proud of only as long as these resources are not yet depleted. Easter Island comes to mind. Short-term progress is not long-term progress. Successes such as improved health and life expectancy are built on sand if we do not reverse this.

Let me share two examples that illustrate present-day approaches to ecological sustainability. Kosheek Sewchurran, Associate Professor in Innovation Management and Information Systems, and director for the Executive MBA program at the Graduate School of Business in Cape Town, invited me on 5th July 2013 to present my book *A Dignity Economy* (Lindner, 2012a). He just was back from the First Innovation for Sustainability Conference convened by the Academy of Business in Society in Copenhagen, Denmark, 12-15th June 2013. He reported the following: ‘At the conference, the marketing directors of Unilever excitedly pointed to the huge opportunities to sell products to a growing population of consumers in India, Brazil, Africa, and China. While this utopian view of profitability is a reality, the CEO also pointed out that this will imply that we need six to nine extra planets, as well as growth levels with an environmental impact that goes far beyond the current planetary boundaries’ (Kosheek Sewchurran, *Reflections on the First Innovation for Sustainability Conference run by the Academy of Business in Society*, 29th July 2013).

As we see, in the case of Unilever, a multinational corporation has in fact understood that, as more consumers strive for the basic luxuries of so-called developed nations in the developing world, planetary boundaries will be surpassed. Yet, as Sewchurran pointed out, ‘the business imperative seems still to be to do it [reach the boundaries] before somebody else does it’. Sewchurran urges for a move from *compliance* to *responsibility* as both a societal and a business rationale.

So far, voices like Sewchurran’s may be heard at certain local levels. Sadly, however, they are not heard at relevant global levels. Hitting planetary boundaries as quickly as possible appears to be the predominant strategy. What currently unfolds is a kind of global hostile takeover, largely proceeding unnoticed by those who will be affected by it, namely, all of us. What I refer to, for instance, is the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP): ‘A new treaty being negotiated in secret between the US and the EU has been specifically engineered to give companies what they want—the dismantling of all social, consumer and environmental protection, and compensation for any infringement of their assumed rights’, writes Lori M. Wallach, director of Public Citizen’s Global Trade Watch, in her article ‘The Corporation Invasion’ in *Le Monde Diplomatique* on 2nd December 2013 (<http://mondediplo.com/2013/12/02tafta>).

In balance, we, the human family on planet Earth, are triumphantly marching into a dead end, faster than alternative directions can be established. A meta-transition is needed, away from rigid paradigms, away also from rigid strategies for change, away from finger-pointing and blame-games, toward co-creating a new kind of continuous reflexive process, a globally collaborative dignifying process (Lindner, 2012b).

Global plundering

Certain kinds of global awareness and global citizenship make things worse. The Trans Pacific Partnership is a prime example. We do not even have to speak of global crime or terrorism. If we want to believe journalist David Rothkopf, a small number (circa 6,000) of largely unelected powerful people (largely male) around the globe, what he calls the ‘super class’, shape the world (Rothkopf, 2008). One can meet them at gatherings such as the annual meeting in Davos in Switzerland. Also the average *frequent traveller* may do considerable damage. He (it is often a man) dashes from one international hotel to the other, uses the planet as a leisure park for the few chosen ones, served by the unlucky rest. Otherwise he targets the commons of our world as unexploited market opportunities. And many in the Global North, wealthy Thais included, prefer to imitate the superclass, rather than wake up and invest in a radical turnaround. Many yearn to live in a ‘shopping-mall Kindergarten bubble’, which includes a selection of holiday resort beaches, and as soon as they have achieved this, they mistake this bubble for the ‘normal’ reality of our world. And all around the globe many academics, rather than resisting this trend, currently turn themselves into its lackeys.

I come out of both conferences both more hopeful and more concerned than I was before. As mentioned earlier, the courage of Chulalongkorn students in Bangkok to take up sensitive social issues impressed me. I can’t repeat often enough how much I appreciate that Kjell Skjellstad, together with Bussakorn Binson and Alan Kinear, brought together such a fascinating conference and that they edit such an influential journal. Likewise, Chayan Vaddhanaphuti, at Chiang Mai University, is a beacon of dignity. Both conferences brought together the spoken word with visual images and personal experiences in masterly ways. At the Chiang Mai conference, we also had the privilege of being invited to two excursions into rural Northern Thailand. First, on 10th–11th March 2014, the third and fourth day of our conference, we visited Suan Lahu, a Lahu village. Then, after the conference, on 13th and 14th March, we paid a visit to the Karen (Ngak’ Nyau) village of Ban Nong Thao. These visits deepened the understanding that Victoria Vorreiter and Jeffrey Warner had already brought to us through their excellent exhibitions that were part of the Chiang Mai conference.

In Suan Lahu, Carina zur Strassen was our host. She has a background from Peru, Germany, and Asia. In her house, a famous poster was on display, a poster that depicts Native American leader Sitting Bull and quotes the legendary Cree prophecy: ‘When all the trees have been cut down, when all the animals have been hunted, when all the waters are polluted, when all the air is unsafe to breathe, only then will you discover you cannot eat money’. Carina zur Strassen gave me hope. I immensely admire her for her courageous commitment to heeding the wise Cree warning.

Likewise, the dedication of Joni Odochaw and his family in the Karen village of Ban Nong Thao gave me hope. He eloquently explained to us how traditional community learning works—everybody in a traditional Karen village had skills to be student and teacher—and we were introduced to their ‘Lazy School’ concept. See the videos that we made to document the important hours of learning at www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/videos.php#thailand.

Joni Odochaw is a wisdom teacher in the field of natural resources and environmental management. In 8-10th August 2012, he participated in the ‘Inaugural International Symposium on Local Wisdom and Improving Quality of Life’, in Chiang Mai and he is described on one of the conference’s posters as follows:

Born and raised in a Karen village of Northern Thailand, Kru Joni Odochaw witnessed major changes in the highlands and became concerned about the erosion of Karen culture and the rapid degradation of the environment. Elected as headman of his village, Kru Joni led 13 other hill tribe groups in a campaign to protect forests and wild animals and map out

collective action for watershed management in harmony with nature. Together they promoted ecological farming and consecrated 50 million trees. He also led an effort to form the northern farmers' alliance, to set up the Mae Wang River Basin conservation network, and to open a rice bank. As a Karen elder, he strongly believes in Karen wisdom and stresses relationship with the environment. Kru Joni was instrumental in developing local curricula for hill tribe people's education emphasizing their own culture. He is also actively involved in knowledge sharing and has served as an advisor and resource person for several NGOs and government agencies.

Sadly, I come out of both conferences also more concerned than before. Thailand is a country that never was colonised. It is immensely saddening for me to see this lovely country be sucked empty now by global economic pressures just in the same ugly way as everywhere else. It shocked me to witness the brutality of the onslaught of unsustainable so-called 'modern' market forces on sustainable traditional life styles. Even the Karen wisdom might not survive for much longer. Thailand is in decay. After living in Thailand in 1981, I believe I have the authority to say that. From my time in Thailand in 1981, I remember the sweet sides of traditional Thai culture. I see it survive only in small niches now, as it faces the onslaught from a Western dominator culture. The *dominator model of society* is a term coined by social scientist Riane Eisler, 1987. This dominator culture represents an extreme form of psychological, social, and cultural impoverishment compared with the complexity of social cohesion in many traditional societies, not just in Thailand. Unfortunately, it is inherent in domination that it trumps partnership if left unchecked by collective resistance. Todd Saurman works with minorities in Chiang Mai and he presented his work in both conferences. He reported that egalitarian indigenous communities are being pushed out by hierarchical majority groups. In present times, it is Western dominator culture that colonises the world more than ever before, and I observe this on all continents. Only the justification is new, no longer to 'civilize savages', but cloaked in the language of 'business' and 'development'.

Agribusiness can serve as an illustration. Black tarps cover the rural landscape, as we witnessed during our visit to Suan Lahu. Underneath these tarps is commercial flower agribusiness, pesticides poison the farmers, and they are all in debt. The price for 'development' is too high if it is paid for with the plundering of social and ecological resources and the poisoning of what is left.

Tourism is another example. As Chayan Vaddhanaphuti formulated it poignantly when we first met on 7th March 2014: commercial tourism is worse than prostitution. It looks for 'unspoiled' spots on the globe, spoils them, and then moves on.

Advertisement boards litter the highway to Pattaya, where big corporate developers promise a 'glamorous lifestyle' to young couples, the imagined glamorous lifestyle of Western individualism. The country hopes that this promise will attract enough 'believers' and that this will help generate 'healthy economic growth and development', as well as 'poverty reduction'. Yet, reality is brutal. It is the brutal destruction of quality of life for the sake of quantity of profit, the destruction of quality at all levels: psychological, social, cultural, and environmental. Whatever growth is achieved in this way, to my view, is poisonous. It may seem 'healthy' for a few investors, in the short term, and if poverty is calculated in terms of participation in a profit-driven system, some may be 'lifted out of poverty' just for a while, before everything is polluted. Development and poverty reduction through these methods reveal themselves to be cover-ups that draw unsuspecting people into toxic bargains, bargains where short-term, short-sighted gains that enrich a few are achieved through practices that poison the lives of many for generations—a price too high for all involved. There are better ways to dignify the world, less costly ways.

A beach paradise like the coast of Southern Thailand is idyllic and therefore attractive. However, it is attractive only as long as it is pristine and unpolluted. Yet, there is no profit for investors to be made from romantic indigenous fishing villages and beaches left untouched. If at all, only the villagers themselves may earn a little extra money by integrating a few backpackers into their village, as happened on the island of Ko Samui when I was there in 1981. By now, the villagers have lost their island to big money. Because at this point, ‘developers’ have stepped in. Their role is to make the impossible possible, to square the circle so to speak, namely, to gloss over the destruction of a paradise for profit by replacing the attraction from pristine nature by the attraction from so-called luxurious and glamorous life-style. The huge bill boards reads: ‘The ultimate beachfront High-rise’.

I would translate this into: ‘The ultimate beachfront High-destruction’. Because in reality, the promised luxurious life is a nightmare. Not only are these beachfront high-rise buildings an eyesore, their ugliness thrown into particularly stark contrast by the sad left-overs of the former paradise surrounding them, they also consume energy and water resources at highly irresponsible levels, and they would require an immense amount of maintenance to even faintly resemble their glossy bill boards. In reality, these constructions look shabby and dilapidated even before they are finished, even if one were blind for the ugliness of their design.

In short, here, investors invest in real-estate, believing this to be a shrewd move to protect their wealth, and they justify this as their contribution to job creation and poverty reduction. Yet, they undermine their own aims by their narrow focus on short-term profit from spoiling, and then glossing over the spoilage, and at the end, everybody will lose out, including the investors. As mentioned before, the brutality of this new form of colonisation, clearly, is rampant everywhere on our planet; it is only more visible in places such as Pattaya. In 2012, I happened to personally witness a similar situation at the sea front of Recife, Brazil.

Antalya in Turkey is an interesting lesson to study for all countries with idyllic paradises that attract investor interest: first there is the paradise, then come a few backpackers, then tourists who walk in the streets, eat out and shop, thus bringing some income to the local population. Finally, before everything collapses, comes ‘all-inclusive’. This happens now in Antalya. Small local hotels can no longer compete with the huge hotel machines which offer ‘all-inclusive’ packages to tourists. These big operators have the power, due to the masses of tourists they attract, to press local personnel into quasi-slavery. And since the tourists stay inside their hotels all day, the shops and restaurants in town have to close. Watch the documentary ‘Schnäppchen-Urlaub Türkei - Sonne, Strand und Billiglohn’ (www.youtube.com/watch?v=B4dsYI-7Gok).

My message to countries with paradises that attract investor interest is as follows: Beware, you will be sucked empty! Stop worshipping investor-driven development! Stop selling out your country’s quality of life! Work for alternative constitutive rules for the global economic affairs of our human family! (See also my book *A Dignity Economy*, Lindner, 2012a.)

My message to tourists is as follows: Stop being complicit in social and ecological destruction! Stop ‘relaxing’ for the price of destruction! Travel on your own, meet with people respectfully, and turn tourism into a tool that manifests the fact that we are one human family who has to become the steward of our planet, rather than its destructor.

Agribusiness and tourism are just two examples of what happens also in other segments of society, both in rural and urban settings. Plunder is being introduced, justified, and made possible in myriad ways, leading to the decay of the social and ecological fabric. From the educational system to media, every segment of society is involved.

Indeed, education and media provide another illustration. I have become more aware than ever how education contributes to the race to the bottom toward self-inflicted quasi-slavery of whole societies and communities. Traditionally, children in the Karen village learn by being

part of daily village life. Now, as they go to school, they fail to learn what is needed in a comprehensive sustainable self-sufficient village. Instead, they train to stiffen their bodies and become obedient cog-wheels feeding a larger unsustainable system. When we visited Joni Odochaw, he had just returned from a community meeting on the rise of domestic violence in Thai communities. Starting from school-age, education is geared to make people believe that it is 'natural' to obediently compete for dominance, that is it great to enthusiastically run in the rat race, glorifying it as the 'success of the brightest', but ending in rising drug-abuse and domestic violence at micro and meso levels and the collapse of entire ecosystems at macro levels.

Television in the evenings underpins this trend: we were dismayed to see how everybody in the village now is passively glued to images of advertisement creating new 'needs', interrupted by violent films that capitalise on people's fascination with demons and glorifying fighting. There is no space anymore for listening to elders and integrated mutual community learning. This is the destruction of humanity's social resources, and it prepares the ground for the destruction of our ecological resources.

What we learn is that the building of schools has nothing to do with education. Rather, our aim must be to go from traditional community learning to modern community learning. This means leaving behind, as fast as possible, the present-day dead-end approach that destroys community learning through education being fashioned in ways that introduce the uniformity and obedience of military camps and Fordian factories. The dominator model of society is built on values of male competition; it needs to give way to the *partnership model* of the traditionally female role script of relationship building in cooperation.

This means also giving priority to what anthropologist Alan Page Fiske calls *communal sharing*. Fiske found that people, most of the time and in all cultures, use just four elementary and universal *relational models* for organizing most aspects of sociality (Fiske, 1991). These models are: (1) *communal sharing*, CS, (2) *authority ranking*, AR, (3) *equality matching*, EM, and (4) *market pricing*, MP. Family life is often informed by communal sharing. Trust, love, care, and intimacy can prosper in this context. In a good family, everybody gives according to ability, as a gift, and receives according to need. Authority ranking involves asymmetry among people who are ordered along vertical hierarchical social dimensions. This can express itself as good parenting or as brutal dictatorship. Good parenting can go together with communal sharing, while brutal dictatorship destroys communal sharing. Equality matching implies a model of balance such as taking turns, for instance, in car pools or babysitting cooperatives. The understanding of promise as a depersonalized contract occurs here. Market pricing builds on a model of proportionality with respect to ratios and rates.

Nurturing the partnership model means taking communal sharing as primary guidance, defining authority ranking as respect for the wisdom of elders and the innovative spirit of youngsters, and relegating equality matching and market pricing to the necessary minimum rather than allowing it to impoverish society and destroy communities.

To nurture the partnership model has never been as important as in our modern era. When the world was not yet as interconnected as it is today, competition for domination led to 'victory' in some cases. Now, in an interconnected world, it leads to collective short-sightedness, which, in turn, may lead all of humankind into collective suicide. What is neglected in the rush for elusive victory, are the advantages of prevention over damage-control and the benefits from slow thinking (see, among others, the book *Thinking, Fast and Slow*, by Daniel Kahneman, 2011). I am very glad to have met the 'Lazy Man' and having learned about the Lazy School at the Karen village Ban Nong Thao. How gratifying that these villagers were hesitant ('lazy') to jump on the bandwagon of collective destruction, cloaked as 'modern ways'.

While I write these lines, I receive an email from activist Charles Eisenstein that shows that the Lazy Man is not alone. Eisenstein writes on 3rd April 2014:

I just got back from a trip to India that was both heartening and alarming. Many of the things I write about are rooted in ancient tradition and living practice there; meanwhile, the pace of ecocide and culture stripping is appalling. Billboards everywhere display a North American style nuclear family Pepsi-drinking brand-worshipping car-dependent high-tech lifestyle, as if its desirability were beyond dispute. I spoke a lot about how we in the West are beginning to disbelieve in that kind of development. I said that the days of the guy from America coming to tell you what to do are almost over. 'I don't know what you should do', I said, 'but let me tell you where "development" has taken my society and the planet'. Of course I also described how the global financial system pushes India and everyone else toward the standard development model, which usually corresponds to making the social and natural commons maximally available to global capital.

After the conferences, I spent a few days in Cambodia. Poi Pet and Siem Reap resembled the Thailand as I loved it 30 years ago. I got the feel of community—each little building I saw had its very own particular individual touch. Only seldom did I see 'developers' at work with their anonymous multiplied prototype approach which empties communities of their diversity and soul and turns community members into the consumers of prefabricated space for outside investors to profit.

Not just in Asia, not just on its beaches, world-wide, wealthy investors look for ways to protect and augment their wealth, and they look for projects that would give them a return on their investment. This inspires developers to search for places where outsiders can extract profit from local communities. So, developers create projects for investors that destroy local communities to extract profit. They do this in Thailand and have almost destroyed the country's traditional social fabric by now. Sadly, Cambodian slave-like labour contributes to this destruction, and draws Cambodian society into this weakening of the social fabric itself in the process. I was told that the same process of sucking out profit for outsiders from local neighbourhoods has begun in Phnom Penh now, too. Investors want to bulldoze communities with small houses to build larger buildings.

Global awareness and solidarity is needed more than ever. The citizens of the world are called to follow Stéphane Hessel and to stand up. Yet, sadly, there is more bad news. Certain aspects of globalisation intensify local navel-gazing and hinder the emergence of global responsibility. The reason is that humans share a tendency to split into in- and out-groups. Unfortunately, even the most innocent 'we', if it means 'we, as opposed to them', may end in the desperate question of 'why do they hate us?' This trend is intensified in a world that becomes ever more confusing and fear-inducing for people who were accustomed to secure cultural roots when they feel that the ground beneath them is falling away through globalisation. Globalisation makes the world frightfully *liquid* (Bauman, 2010). Displaced people, refugees and many indigenous peoples have always tasted insecurity, the very insecurity that globalisation now brings to the rest.

The *contact hypothesis*, or the hope that mere contact can foster friendship, is not necessarily true (Allport, 1954, Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). On the contrary, where there is no contact, there is no humiliation. Contact can unsettle, it can motivate people to rigidify their in-group identifications rather than to open up, and the more people know about each other, out-groups will feel insulted and respond in kind. The Danish cartoons brought this new reality to the world most vividly (Hartling & Luchetta, 1999, Lindner, 2006 and Lindner, 2009a). A vicious cycle can be set off, starting with insecurity and escalating to hostility and

humiliation. The world can turn into a powerhouse of hostility, a hotbed for terrorism, when contact creates new dynamics of humiliation.

Humiliation becomes particularly painful when human rights are preached with noble words that create high hopes, only to turn out as empty rhetoric: ‘To recognise humanity hypocritically and betray the promise humiliates in the most devastating way by denying the humanity professed’ (Stephan Feuchtwang, November 14, 2002, in a personal communication; see also Hartling & Luchetta, 1999, Lindner, 2006 and Lindner, 2009a).

Must we therefore forget about global citizenship of care and responsibility?

Global family building

Let me share some of my personal experiences. During both conferences, we saw the film *Banaz: A Love Story*, by Deeyah Khan (www.youtube.com/watch?v=VepuyvhHYdM). For many years, I have been working in situations where honour killing is practiced. Imagine a mother in front of you, crying, explaining that it is the family’s duty to rescue the family’s honour from humiliation, to save the family’s body by ‘amputating’ a diseased limb. In this case, this limb is the daughter. She had been raped. She must be killed. While listening to the mother, you may feel your very humanity being humiliated by the mere suggestion that killing a raped girl could have any kind of healing effect. Now, what would happen if you expressed this feeling to the mother, bluntly, and called her a cruel, ignorant woman? She might feel humiliated by you, the decadent arrogant Westerner, who denigrates her culture.

What happens here? In the moral universe of honour and humiliation, the girl must die, in the universe of dignity and humiliation, the girl must live, and the discourse that addresses this irreconcilable difference is humiliating for all involved.

I ask: why do you think you are right? Did you grow up in a context that holds the ideals of human rights dear? Should you not respect this mother’s culture? For her, love means having the courage of the surgeon who rescues a body through amputation. For you, love means giving trauma therapy to the girl. Can we create universal harmony by simultaneously offering respect for the girl to be killed and not be killed?

It has taken me a lifetime to develop the argument for why I think ‘I am right’ when I say that a girl who was raped must live and receive trauma therapy rather than be killed in so-called honour killing. And why and how, at the same time, the mother can and must be respected. Or why and how all people of this world can and must be invited to join in with their respective religious orientation, sense of patriotism and nationalism. Or why and how the love for nature can and must be both local and global. Or why and how dogma can be transcended through radical self-reflexive humility that, in turn, can open space for religious experiences that unite beyond dogma. The same goes for the philosophy of science, metaphysics, ontology and epistemology. Humility is helpful also with regard to human rights ideals. They are part of many philosophies around the world—*Ubuntu* in Africa is one example, the Karen wisdom of a Joni Odochaw another—and their roots go far back into Western and non-Western history.

Since the age of nine, such questions have been at the core of my life. As a child, I was unable to share my family’s choice of religious dogma, because it forced me to separate those who are saved by God from those whose souls were lost if they resisted conversion. I could not endorse eternal condemnation for non-believers, something even more far-reaching than killing an earthly body. What would be the path to global inclusiveness in this case? If not theism, then agnosticism or atheism? In my life, I came to transcend them all.

Why am I right? Because we live in unique historical times. Traditional strategies no longer work when reality has radically changed. We live in times of connectedness, where

interdependence replaces the traditional dichotomy of dependence versus independence. Old *Realpolitik* is different from new *Realpolitik*.

Clearly, what is called globalisation, in its origin, is largely a ‘Davos’ inspired project, creating new dependencies to secure investor confidence and shareholder value. The technology that now shrinks the world emerged from within the dominator model of society, which now manifests as an eerie return of colonisation, only more indirectly and covertly, more efficiently co-opting its victims into becoming complicit in their own victimhood. Globalisation, as it stands now, is far from a charitable project.

Yet, the same project also creates new interconnectedness, which carries the potential to undermine its original aims by opening doors for the solidarity of global partnership. The world shrinks, one single human family emerges, and its members increasingly embraced the belief that they deserve equality in dignity not just in rhetoric but in reality. They slowly realise that they are entrapped in contexts that are covertly rigged to create immense wealth for a few elites, and they learn that this entrapment is shamefully humiliating, rather than God’s will or the natural order of things.

Clearly, donating more to charity is not enough. While I write this, a message comes in from nef (the new economics foundation for economics as if people and the planet mattered), announcing their new report, titled, ‘Why We Need a New Macroeconomic Strategy’ (www.neweconomics.org/publications/why-we-need-a-new-macroeconomic-strategy). But who shall work for new macroeconomic strategies? Politicians? Corporate leaders? The more a person has become powerful within a system, the more she will be beholden its existing status-quo pressures. Jan Servaes and Darrell Moen shared something very important in the Chiang Mai conference, namely, that academics are not necessarily listened to by politicians, also in UN contexts. Jan Servaes told us that he avoids being drawn into political pressures and he is very protective of his independence as an academician. This experience is shared by many members of our global dignity network. Not least my personal experience coincides with this insight. Who else shall work for new macroeconomic strategies? Bottom-up local initiatives that introduce alternative systems? If exposed to global pressures, the very space that is needed for diverse local expressions to develop is obliterated. Local versus global is a false choice: the local needs appropriate global frameworks to be truly local and diverse, to be sufficiently protected from global pressures that push it into uniformity (Lindner, 2012a).

Only a few people have the opportunity to step outside of these pressures. They therefore carry the responsibility to show that globalising Wall Street frameworks is not the only alternative; there is another path, namely the globalisation of frameworks of mutual care and stewardship. ‘Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has’, said anthropologist Margaret Mead (1901–1978).

Many believe that nothing can change before not human nature matures, and that this will take too long. At this point, social psychology has significant insights to offer. It shows the power of framing. If social psychologists ask students to play the prisoner’s dilemma game, and they tell them that this is a community game, the students cooperate. The students cheat on each other when told that the very same game is a Wall Street game. This is the power of framing: the same people can behave in radically different ways within different frameworks. Human nature is malleable, and ‘good’ frameworks bring the ‘good’ to the fore, and vice versa. This means that new frameworks can create a systemic push for our evolutionary inclinations to be social and this will motivate us to connect and collaborate for the common good rather than plundering it.

And here is more good news: Realistic optimism is justified. None of our forefathers was ever given a window of opportunity as unique and significant as presented to contemporary generations. The *ingathering* of humankind (a term used in anthropology) opens space to co-

create a global culture of unity in diversity that has never existed before. None of our forefathers had access to the vast knowledge about the universe and our place in it that current generations possess. The picture of our Blue Planet from the perspective of an astronaut is something that none of our ancestors was able to see. The Blue Planet image alone provides a powerful framing for changing the game from competition for dominance to collaboration in partnership. It shows most vividly that one single species of *Homo sapiens* is living on one single tiny planet.

Yet, we, the human family, so far, seem to be failing to understand how historically unparalleled this opportunity is. Even many of those who have the resources to see are overlooking the uniqueness of this opening. We are particularly overlooking the pivotal role that radical global citizenship of dignity and care must and can play.

Why are we overlooking it? Because many have a salaried employment that keeps them in a local context, or, at best, in a ‘frequent traveller’ bubble. We overlook it, because we hope that our politicians or at least the United Nations will understand and repair the global frameworks. We also feel that these frameworks are too complicated for us to understand anyhow. We hope that giving to charity will be enough. The practice of global citizenship of dignity and care is new and untested and requires the deep restructuring of our assumptions and personal lives.

I remember peace researcher Johan Galtung discussing why there are so few peace scholars in the world (Lindner, 2009b). At the Higher Education for Peace Conference, 4th–6th May 2000, in Norway’s far north, in Tromsø, he explained that only very few peace advocates truly live globally (as Galtung does)—most are bound to local contexts not least through such profane circumstances as having to pay off a mortgage—and this contrasts with those well-financed and well-travelled Pentagon experts who use the entire world as their basis for analysis and strategizing. In other words, the lens of the average peace advocate is too narrow, both with respect to geopolitics and historical trends, to outweigh those others who engage in traditional power politics.

I am among the very few who have tried to live truly globally, and I did so for the past forty years. I do not ask everybody to follow my path, yet, I call for humility when you listen to me. Lived global experience provides unexpected insights. A non-global citizen can only theorise about global citizenship, while I stand before the immense task of having to build a new world-view. Many assumptions which can be held dear locally, are being shattered by the practice of global living.

The Western culture of *separate knowing* (Belenky, Bond, & Weinstock, 1997) aggravates this situation. Therefore I invite the reader to listen to my practice of global citizenship in the humble spirit of *connected knowing* (rather than only trying to find flaws to oppose). Peter Svenonius, a theoretical linguist who is also based in Tromsø, at CASTL (Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Linguistics—A Norwegian Center of Excellence), explains that language was not created for the goal of communicating; rather, language was created for use in thinking. This is how I employ language, as a tool for inquiry, and I invite the reader to join in to the flow of reflection, rather than close the flow by judging with the aim to agree or disagree. I want to inspire, open space for new reflections, rather than engage in debate.

In my view, only radical global citizenship of dignity and care can overcome the *security dilemma* as well as the *commons dilemma*. Global citizenship of dignity and care can help the traditional world of ranked worthiness, or honour, to move to a world of equal dignity, and this includes a transition from what I call *honour humiliation* to *dignity humiliation*. Honour humiliation is part of humankind’s cultural adaptations to the security dilemma. Humiliated honour requires revenge and the show of strength to achieve victory over the humiliator. The script of honour humiliation is the script of Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany. Dignity

humiliation, in contrast, calls for the *conscientisation* of Paulo Freire, to which Nelson Mandela so courageously dedicated his life (Freire, 1968, Freire, 1970).

The security dilemma is being described by international relations scholars (the term was coined by John Herz, 1950) and it means that in a compartmentalised world there is virtually no escape from the motto ‘If you want peace, prepare for war’. Indeed, throughout the past millennia, arms races, fuelled by fear of attack, often triggered the war they intended to avoid. Only global citizenship of dignity and care can open space for Gandhi’s tenet that ‘There is no path to peace. Peace is the path’.

And the commons dilemma means that commons are always vulnerable to free-riders and plunderers (Hardin, 1968). Throughout the past three decades, the Wall Street with its culture of raiding has become the accepted global frame and it has become so strong that even the most well-intentioned politician is no longer free enough to push for community framings. Investor confidence is what counts, what must be served. All around the world, wherever commons are successfully protected and enlarged locally, they risk being invaded and raided from outside. Local community initiatives routinely falter when they collide with the larger global Wall Street frame. I see great civil society projects getting funded initially, but when they achieve real impact, funding is often cut. All around the world, I meet dedicated idealists who have given up, increasingly disillusioned, some end as cynics. Funds have their origins in the context of business, and ‘good works’ are expected to avoid hurting business interests. Even the most robust alternative initiatives, such as the Mondragon cooperatives in Spain, for example, are not strong enough in the face of an antagonistic global context (Gar Alperovitz in his talk at the Thirty-First Annual E. F. Schumacher Lectures on 5th November 2011, in New York City). Non-profits are increasingly selling out their ideals to for-profit thinking. Even humanitarian aid has become a business.

Who are investors? Who are donors? It is naïve to treat donor and investor interest as a black box, as something that should not be questioned, because, supposedly ‘it is the freedom of the rich to do as they please with their wealth, and nobody can expect them to act against their self-interest and give their hard-earned funds to initiatives that hurt them’. Consider the absurdity: ‘Why must not-for-profit organizations beg for funds from for-profit organizations to do so-called *good* work to offset the freedom of for-profit organizations to do *bad* work?’ (Lindner, 2012a, p. 209). Only a massive bottom-up push can change this, a push from the consciousness and practice of caring global citizens who truly walk their talk. After living globally for almost four decades, I can attest that it can be done.

Maria Dahle is the Executive Director of the Human Rights House Foundation (HRHF), a non-governmental organisation established in 1989 and located at the Human Rights House in Oslo, Norway. She reports first-hand how human rights defenders are increasingly being constrained by the influence of ‘bigger’ interests of the government/corporate nexus:

The 90’s were a ‘decade of hope’ for human rights. Around the world, civil society in general, and the human rights sector in particular, experienced an explosive growth. Since then, working with human rights has gradually required ever more specific expertise. In response, many organisations have become more professional. Their work is often donor driven, and therefore they have become more bureaucratic, less creative and spontaneous. Several of the human rights organisations, especially the international and those working in the capitals, have become part of a national and international elite and are often less connected—or not connected at all—to social movements. Hence, they lose support from their own people (Dahle, 2008, p. 3).

In 2011, Maria Dahle continues:

Tighter restrictions on holding peaceful demonstrations and gatherings have been introduced, often with reference to the need for increased security. Our partners in the Human Rights House Network report also here on increased sophisticated administrative and bureaucratic harassment of NGOs and activists planning peaceful demonstrations in OSCE participating states. The new laws and regulations legitimize the police' excessive use of violence against the demonstrators and massive arrest of participants. Journalists on duty covering the events are often beaten, detained, harassed and interrogated by national security forces (Dahle, 2011, p. 2).

Let me give you an example from my own experience. I spent four months in South America in 2012. Particularly eye-opening were my weeks in Marabá, in the state of Pará, Brazil, the sad 'cradle' of the industrialisation of the Amazon. Pará is like another continent, compared with the rest of Brazil. It has the size of Western Europe and one landlord can own half a million of cattle. It has an inglorious reputation for its hired gunmen. The following article is illustrative: 'Brazil: Homage to the Victims of the Amazon in Washington, D.C', in *Global Voices*, written by João Miguel D. de A. Lima, translated by Georgi McCarthy on 16th April 2012 (<http://globalvoicesonline.org/2012/04/16/brazil-amazon-victims-washington/>).

My hosts were Dan Baron and his wife Manoela Souza, who live in a local community of about 30 000 souls called Cabelo Seco, at the confluence of two rivers, the Tocantins and Itacaiúnas rivers. Dan Baron and Manoela Souza are the artistic-pedagogic coordinators of the Rivers of Meeting project. Cabelo Seco is an extremely poor community. The roof above me, for example, leaked when it rained and I had to cover my computer and all other valuables with plastic sheets. Yet, poverty is not the only problem. Not only hired gunmen, also drugs are being used to weaken communities who stand in the way of 'progress', crack is given out for free until people are addicted, creating a toxic mixture of hopelessness and violence. Just when I was in Cabelo Seco, two people were killed in execution style a few houses away from where I was.

Music has the power to unite. One example was given by Oslo citizens when they reacted to the 22 July 2011 terror attacks in Norway by gathering in front of the courthouse singing 'The Rainbow People'. Also Manoela Souza and Dan Baron give the community of Cabelo Seco strength through music and popular art. They have turned the living room in their little house in the middle of Cabelo Seco into the cultural centre of this community. See more on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/board01.php#dancohen.

It is interesting to see that Dan Baron, like Carina zur Strassen, and many other members in our global dignity network, share backgrounds that bridge several continents. People with such broad backgrounds seem to be particularly alert to the power of art. Carina zur Strassen, for instance, drew our attention to the 'Landfill Harmonic - An Orchestra for Kids with Instruments Made from Trash' in Paraguay, to be seen at www.youtube.com/watch?v=sJxxdQox7n0.

I chose Marabá over Rio + 20 because I had understood that the voices of the people in the Amazon are not heard, even not in Rio or Brasilia, and I wanted to hear them and bring their voices to larger audiences. Just to give one example: I saw first-hand that the river ten meters away from the house where I stayed is being polluted with mercury; it is a dying river. Children in the Cabelo Seco community become blind because of the toxic particles in the water.

As it turned out, my presence in Marabá was extremely meaningful, much more than I initially thought. It made a difference that it could not have made in Rio + 20, where I was invited, too. Being alerted by my presence, the television came to interview us twice, my host and his community (see www.youtu.be/a_y7G2KFeQo).

Sadly, my worries about Rio + 20 turned out to be warranted. Rio + 20 provided much too little space for real transformation. Nnimmo Bassey, chairman of Friends of the Earth International, summarised the event as follows: ‘Governmental positions have been hijacked by corporate interests linked to polluting industries’.

Pará is a lesson in predator economics, the Amazon is a frontier of raiding. The natural resources are being plundered and whoever stands in the way has to fear for their life. More than 1,500 Brazilians have been killed for trying to protect the Amazon rain forest over the past twenty-five years, and some 2,000 more have received death threats (see Comissão Pastoral da Terra, CPT, www.cptnacional.org.br). The brutality of this state-of-affairs in our world, clearly, is omnipresent on our planet; it is only more sharply visible at front-lines such as the Amazon. A consumer who revels in buying several cell phones, for example, usually spares herself the awareness that she uses up rare minerals that must be mined somewhere. The Amazon is one of the places where the mining is being done, and its ugliness and unsustainability is glaringly visible for those who refuse being complicit.

With respect to South America as a whole, the Paraguayan coup was illustrative: ‘How Agribusiness, Landowning and Media Elite, and the U.S. Are Paving a Way for Regional Destabilization’, writes Francesca Fiorentini on 4th July 2012 in Buenos Aires, see war-times.org. Or, here is an example from the United States of America: ‘The Scam Wall Street Learned From the Mafia’, is an article that describes how America’s biggest banks took part in a nationwide bid-rigging conspiracy and systematically stole from schools, hospitals, libraries and nursing homes (by Matt Taibbi in *Rolling Stone Politics*, rollingstone.com, 21st June 2012).

Nowadays, raiding is increasingly being facilitated by public policy. The above-mentioned Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) happens at the highest international level. Similar trends can be observed at national and community levels as well. For instance, the same day I learned that the Brazilian Ministry of Culture no longer funds Living Culture projects committed to harnessing popular culture for the development of sustainable communities (as the project by Dan and Mano does) but only ‘creative industry spectacles’, I also heard that in Norway long-term services for drug addicts will receive less funding and that short-term interventions will be given priority. These are only a few of innumerable examples.

I see social cohesion being weakened qua policy wherever I go. Solidarity is made ever more difficult, solidarity that could be a force for more caring and dignifying ways of relating to each other and our planet. Linda Hartling commented on 11th August 2012: ‘In some ways, I think predatory capitalism offers a form of psychological “crack” until individuals and corporations become addicted to predatory capitalism, which is insatiable and unsustainable’.

As it seems, we, the human family, have a responsibility to think deeper. French economist Frédéric Bastiat (1801–1850) said: ‘When plunder becomes a way of life for a group of men living together in society, they create for themselves, in the course of time, a legal system that authorizes it and a moral code that glorifies it’. Psychologist Seymour Epstein is said to have authored the following reflection: ‘There is a time for pessimism, that is, for considering worst-case scenarios in order to appropriately prepare for them. This does not mean one should not be hopeful, but only that one should be prepared for adverse outcomes rather than blithely assume that all will turn out well. Rather than being naively (indiscriminately) optimistic or pessimistic, it is better to be strategically optimistic and pessimistic’.

As remarked earlier, I posit that it is only global citizenship of dignity and care that can attenuate the security dilemma and open space for Gandhi’s tenet ‘There is no path to peace. Peace is the path’. And local commons are lost without suitable global frames.

A turnaround is possible; here is more good news: All identifications are fickle, except one. Sociologist Norbert Elias said it already in 1939: ‘Only the highest level of integration, belonging to humanity, is permanent and inescapable’ (Elias, 1991, pp. 226–7). Examples

from the Holocaust and the genocide in Rwanda show the force of this identification: some people protected potential victims at great personal risk because they saw them as ‘fellow human beings’ (Lindner, 2000). None other than philosopher and economist Amartya Sen singles out shared humanity as the most basic of shared identities (Sen, 2006).

Like me, Elias laments that too few understand the unique promise of global identification: ‘But our ties to this all-embracing we-unit are so loose that very few people, it seems, are aware of them as social bonds’ (Ibid.).

Hank Stone, to whom I referred to earlier, calls for *radical humility*. He calls on us to reclaim our positive future by setting aside the comforting certainties we grew up with, and to observe the world around us with innocent eyes:

- Because we can ‘know’ things that are not true, we must respect reason and the scientific method of observation and testable hypotheses.
- Because honest people can disagree, we must dialogue with people with differing ideas to find the truth.
- Because there are limits to what we can know, we must tolerate ambiguity.
- Because we share one Earth, we must cooperate with individuals, groups, humankind, and nature. (Hank Stone in *Radical Humility*, <http://philebersole.wordpress.com/2013/03/12/one-page-on-radical-humility/>)

Stone reminds us that we have the unique opportunity, not least through the Internet, to become nodes in the web of the world and make ‘an idea whose time has come circle the world overnight’. We can make a new story, and new institutions for our positive future, ‘because we get to choose the stories we believe’. We can honour ‘the investment the universe has made in us when we humbly try to create a sustainable, just, and peaceful world’.

Stone asked me on 3rd April 2013 (in a personal communication): ‘Do you have a message in the spirit of outreach to people who don’t think your way? Our U.S. foreign policy of the moment seems to be taunting Iran and North Korea, as one might do to humiliate the other into precipitating a war, or something close enough to it to justify continuing high military spending. Have you arguments for people who think that way?’

What would you say? Perhaps the following summary of our analysis?

In old times, aristocrats humiliated each other’s honour and then went to duel. One died, the other survived. This was the way of honour. Honour had to be preserved, even if at the price of one’s life. Also wars were often conducted in a duel-like manner. Indeed, throughout the past millennia, arms races, fuelled by fear of humiliation and annihilation, often triggered the very war they aimed at avoiding. The security dilemma, as being described by international relations scholars, means that in a divided world there was virtually no escape from the motto ‘If you want peace, prepare for war’.

Today, duels are forbidden in most societies, however, the spirit of *honour humiliation* lives on, particularly in international relations. And it even becomes more attractive as arms sales promise to be ever more profitable. As reported above, the international sales of conventional weapons have risen by 17 per cent in the period 2008–2012 as compared to the period 2003–2007 (SIPRI, 2013, www.sipri.org). In that situation, it cannot come as a surprise that many conclude that the script of ‘one dies, the other survives’, if ever it promised wealth for the winner, has increased its attraction multifold today. Usually, people who hold such might-is-right views justify them by alluding to the supposed ‘killer ape’ nature of human beings and warn that soft-hearted liberals will only reap what they deserve, namely extinction.

Yet, today, ‘winning’ is no longer as sure a ‘winning strategy’ as it once was. We live in novel historical times and there are two counterforces. First, global interconnectedness is a counterforce, and, second, human rights values of equality in dignity stand in the way.

As to the first point, traditional adaptations no longer fit when new connectedness and interdependence replace the traditional world of dependence-independence and domination-submission. As mentioned earlier, old *Realpolitik* is not new *Realpolitik*. If deadly cycles of humiliation could be suppressed with sheer force in the past, this is much less obvious in modern times. Remember the Danish cartoons. Remember cyber war. The world is now so interconnected and so vulnerable that a few aggrieved individuals can disrupt it in ways that were not imaginable before. In the past, the game of honour humiliation was played between a few aristocrats or diplomats on behalf of their masters; today the Internet draws the common citizen into this game. If leaders of movements or of nations, be it Al-Qaeda or Iran or North Korea, in their stand-off against ‘the West’, or Western leaders in their attempt to stay in top, create an arena for honour-humiliation scripts today, such aggrieved individuals may act out their fantasies of revenge in ways that make it irrelevant whether those leaders are only bluffing, and who has more weapons. Anders Behring Breivik, in Norway, for example, acted on fantasies of being a knight who rescues his people from unacceptable humiliation. Even if one believes that honour deserves to be paid for by life, or that profit from playing honour games is sweet, in a vulnerable interconnected world, inviting a broader public into games formerly played by a few elites, turns ‘noble deaths’ for a few into possible collective suicide. Games of honour humiliation, if they ever were meaningful, lose this meaning in a vulnerable interconnected world filled not only with ready-to-use weapons but also with easy-to-follow manuals for the construction of weapons of mass destruction. No fence around the gated communities for those who profit from such strategies in the short term can be high enough in the long term.

As to the second point, increasingly, a sense of what I call *dignity humiliation* is emerging all around the world. This means that not only is our world more interconnected, it is also in the process of losing its faith in the virtues of domination and submission. Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) begins: ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’. Humiliation was seen as a prosocial tool to humble underlings in the English language until 1757. From then onward, humiliation acquired the taste of being antisocial, *to humiliate* meant to mortify or to lower or to depress the dignity or self-respect of someone (Miller, 1993). Dignity humiliation is more intense, more painful, than honour humiliation. Dignity humiliation becomes particularly intense when human rights are preached with noble words that create high hopes, only to turn out as empty rhetoric. And the instrumentalisation of honour humiliation for profit and for new forms of domination—war on terror as excuse for undermining civil liberties, for example—is a particularly obscene form of dignity humiliation.

In conclusion, not only is it ethically preferable, it is also practically unavoidable, if humankind wishes to survive, to globalise the insight that the dominator model of society needs to transform into the partnership model, globally and locally.

Global unity in diversity

The adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948 was a great achievement for humankind. Article 1 begins: ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’. Up to now, there has been a strong focus on freedom and rights. Not that this is unimportant. Yet, freedom, rights and dignity can slide into opposition. Dignity must guide the definition of freedom and rights. Therefore, in my view, the time has come to think more about dignity. What is important is a dignified world, both socially and ecologically, or what philosopher Avishai Margalit calls a *decent* world (Margalit, 1996). For Amartya Sen the ‘ability to go without shame’ is a basic capability (Sen, 1985; the *capabilities approach*

was developed by philosopher Martha Nussbaum & Sen, 1993). Sen identifies freedom's constitutive and instrumental roles (Sen, 1999). Only when freedom is defined as a level playing field protected by appropriate frameworks can the common good for all be protected. A culture that defines liberty as unrestrained freedom, including freedom for dominators to make might right, tends to keep those dominators in power and dooms the broader masses to the role of exploited victims (Lindner, 2012a, p. 11).

My favourite motto is *unity in diversity*. Most people misunderstand this motto as a zero sum game. They think that more unity means less diversity, and vice versa. This misunderstanding stems from within the dominator model, because this is indeed what happens there. The strong-man at the top will portray unity as uniformity and will suppress diversity for the sake of uniformity. North Korea is a contemporary example. Dominators will treat diversity as dangerous division and take this as an excuse to impose uniformity. Dominators will exercise their 'right' to enforce uniformity, and they will call this uniformity unity. It is also true that diversity has the potential to destroy unity. This happens when diversity turns into division. A misunderstood concept of freedom can be the cause. When freedom is defined as limitlessness and is allowed to undermine unity, this can unleash destructive social division and ecological exploitation. Religious fundamentalism, supremacism, hubris of all sorts, while using the banner of freedom, tend to be divisive.

Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss developed the notion of the *depth of intention*, or the *depth of questioning*, or *deepness of answers*, 'our depth of intention improves only slowly over years of study. There is an abyss of depth in everything fundamental' (Naess, 1978, p. 143). If we follow Næss and enquire deeper, we understand that it would be a grave mistake to believe that unity's only and true meaning is uniformity and diversity's only and true meaning is division. The opposite is true, if we think through it: uniformity is not the same as unity, and, albeit diversity can be divisive, it must not necessarily be so. In my view, the misinterpretation of the concept of unity in diversity is among the saddest casualties of what I call the single largest 'master manipulation' ever perpetrated in human history, namely the introduction of the dominator model of society, with its *ranking* of worthiness, in contrast to *equality* in worthiness or equality in dignity (Lindner, 2009a, chapter 8). Unfortunately, the culture of ranked worthiness has characterised human history and affected most world regions since the onset of the *Neolithic Era*.

On my global path, I meet widespread fear that global unity will lead to the dissolving of diverse cultural identities into oppressive global uniformity. This fear stems from within the dominator mind-set and is blind to the fact that it is precisely the current lack of global unity that has produced global uniformity: not just the cities of our world today all look the same, *McDonaldization* is everywhere (Ritzer, 1993).

Let me ask: Are we not proud of the name *Homo sapiens* that we have given ourselves? Does not *sapiens* mean wise and knowledgeable? Is not creativity a core characteristic of our human species that we are proud of and cherish? Is not the diversity of cultural expressions a prime manifestation of human creativity? Should we not unite to protect this diversity? If we think through it, as soon as unity is grounded in our shared *sapientia humana*, it becomes a win-win game: more unity means more diversity. More unity means more attention to diversity and more cherishing and nurturing of diversity.

In sum, unity is *not* necessarily the same as oppressive uniformity, and diversity is *not* the same as unrestricted freedom for divisiveness. It needs competency in *nondualist* thinking to grasp that unity in diversity can be a synergistic win-win game. Nondualism means separation *and* connection; agreement *and* disagreement; one *and* two. With unity in diversity, both can grow if kept in mutual balance and magnified and celebrated simultaneously. Both can mature if we unite in acknowledging our shared humanity on a tiny planet, if we recognise our core assets, namely, the creativity manifested in our diversity. Unity is when we acknowledge our

shared humanity on a tiny planet; unity is when we respect that we all are equal in dignity; unity is when we understand that this dignity is enriched by the creativity manifested in our diversity; unity is when we draw on our diversity to create a sustainable future for our children on planet Earth. If nurtured by enough people, a unity-in-diversity identity that is global in scope can foster a global unity-in-diversity culture and co-create institutional frameworks to support it. Unity in diversity is the stark opposite of dissolving diverse cultural identities into global uniformity; it is the opposite of getting uprooted or homeless. It is the building of a more secure sense of home, a home of which we are joint stewards, a home of local diversity in global unity.

Unity in diversity can be operationalised by ways of *subsidiarity*. Subsidiarity means that local decision-making and local identities are retained to the greatest extent possible, while allowing for national, regional and even international decision-making when needed. The European Union uses the subsidiarity principle. Governance systems for large-scale environmental problems, for instance, can only be effective through the subsidiarity principle or *nesting principle* advocated by political economist Elinor Ostrom (Marshall, 2008).

Unity in diversity can also be operationalised by ways of nesting anthropologist Alan Page Fiske's basic relational models mentioned earlier. All of Fiske's universal forms of social relations need to be nested into new global superordinate institutional structures: Communal sharing must take precedence, with authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing serving it. Incidentally, indigenous psychology can be of help here (see Sundararajan, 2012). Co-creating new global framings of communal sharing for our world, a new level of global cohesion—community game frames rather than Wall Street game frames—this is the single most important common superordinate goal and joint task for humankind to attend to at the present historical juncture.

Will this create social cohesion at a global level? Or is it inherently impossible? 'Multiculturalism has failed' is the verdict in some European societies. Psychologist John Berry explains that 'one difficulty in discussions of the meaning of multiculturalism, both in Canada and internationally, has been the simple equating of multiculturalism with cultural diversity' (Berry, 2013, p. 4). In Berry's view, the success of Canadian policies, in contrast to those in Europe, stems from the fact that Canada places joint value on cultural maintenance (the diversity element) and equitable participation (the intercultural element). 'The Canadian policy has always been more than just the recognition, promotion and celebration of cultural diversity; intercultural sharing, equity and inclusion have been seen as being essential elements in the policy' (Ibid.) In Berry's view cultural pluralism—many independent cultural communities in a society—is not enough; intercultural interaction and equitable participation in the larger society is needed. What is necessary is a move from *ethnicity multiculturalism* (with a focus on cultural diversity), to *equity multiculturalism* (focus on equitable participation), to *civic multiculturalism* (focus on society building and inclusiveness) and finally to *integrative multiculturalism* (focus on identification with the larger society) (Fleras, 2009).

Global social cohesion can be attained if we create the right conditions through global integrative multiculturalism as suggested by Fleras. Findings show that individuals have no problems in holding multiple and mutually compatible collective identities. Diversity and cohesion can go hand in hand. It is the context that makes the difference. An international study of immigrant youth found that national identity and ethnic identity go well together in 'settler societies' such as Australia, Canada, new Zealand and the USA, in contrast to societies such as France, Germany, Norway, Portugal and Sweden, where young immigrants feel they have to choose between possible identities (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder (Eds.) 2006). In other words, the relationship between individuals having dual identities (that is with one's heritage group and the national society) and social cohesion, depends on the way a

society deals with cultural diversity. ‘In societies that promote multiculturalism, these dual identities are secure and compatible, and do not undermine social cohesion. In contrast, in societies that are either new to dealing with cultural diversity, or where such diversity is not recognized or accommodated, there is a negative relationship’ (Berry, 2013, p. 25).

A Scale of Global Identity has been developed by Salman Türken at the University of Oslo, together with Floyd Rudmin from the University of Tromsø, on the psychological aspects of globalisation. They found two clear orthogonal factors, one is ‘cultural openness’, and the other ‘non-nationalism’ (Türken & Rudmin, 2013).

Anthropologist and philosopher Benjamin Lee speaks of *critical internationalism* (Lee, 1995). The field of *indigenous psychology* is on a similar path (Sundararajan, 2012). It asks mainstream psychology to muster the self-reflexivity of competent multiculturalism to see itself in a new light, namely, as an indigenous psychology rooted in the historical and cultural context of Europe and North America (Gergen et al., 1996). The *view from nowhere* that natural sciences claim (Nagel, 1986) must transmute into *local views from somewhere*. A synergy of multiculturalism and internationalism can create bridges between one somewhere and another somewhere. Together, the local construction of meaning and global consciousness can use *multiple somewheres* to arrive at shared visions and goals (Taylor in Lowman, 2013, p. 52, 53). I call this *harvesting* from all world cultures (Lindner, 2007).

Global citizenship of dignity and care: a personal practice

For almost forty years, I have ‘tested’ the hypothesis of whether it is possible to approach all human beings on this planet as my own family. I can attest that there is a profound human eagerness to connect, if met with respect. These are ‘thick attractors’, to use the language of *dynamical systems theory* (Coleman, Bui-Wrzosinska, & Nowak, 2008).

I understand that many people become fearful in a world that turns ever more unpredictable and confusing, or liquid, to use Bauman’s above-mentioned term. Yet, I can attest that true global living provides the stark opposite of fear, namely a sense of security, trust and confidence. I am embedded in many cultures on all continents, far beyond the ‘Western bubble’, and this gives me great confidence. I was born into a displaced family, into an identity of ‘here where we are, we are not at home, and there is no home for us to go to’, and I have healed the pain of displacement by living as a global citizen (Lindner, 2012b). Our forefathers were continuously surprised by new discoveries and fearful of the unknown. They imagined that demons populated far-flung continents. It was taken to be true, for instance, that people with dog heads inhabited the Earth, so-called *cynocephaly*. Entire books were written on the question as to whether these dogheads had souls and were worth being Christianised. In contrast, I have the comforting lived experience of how small planet Earth is and how social human nature is. There are no dogheads around.

I am deeply connected to our environment at a planetary level. I am an avid learner, and the planet is my university. Therefore I am a co-founder of the World Dignity University initiative. With great delight, I listen to Indian educator Satish Kumar calling for a more holistic approach to education, connecting our hands, hearts and heads (TEDxWhitechapel, www.youtube.com/watch?v=VAz0bOtfVfE). Kumar acknowledges that the words *ecology* and *economy* come from the same Greek word: *oikos*, meaning *home*. Ecology is the study of our home and economy is its management. Kumar faults our education systems for the pervasive lack of a genuine understanding of nature, which is contributing to the gross mismanagement of our planet.

Kumar would have loved what we learned about the Lazy School at the Ngak’ Nyau (Karen) village of Ban Nong Thao. Joni Odochaw and his family helped us better understand

the dilemma that education, TV, and the digital world can either be beneficial or destructive to sustainable ways of living. As Peter Dering, the first student of the Lazy School, formulated it on 13th March 2014: ‘Our vision must be to expand community learning to include modern knowledge through technology, rather than lose community learning!’

After our visit, we sent the following ‘Proclamation on Rural Resilience’ to the United Nations:

The Millennium Development Goals have achieved many of their aims. Now we look to the future for the next period of sustainable development goals.

We miss an important perspective that we feel should be accounted for so that the spirit of sustainable development is in accordance with current thinking and includes all the peoples of the world.

As a result of two conferences focusing on dignity and humiliation, which included two field trips to the northern parts of Thailand, we urge to explicitly include rural communities within the future goals. We want to particularly highlight that indigenous peoples commonly live in rural communities and that they are neglected by the general thrust as it is now.

We call for a Sustainable Development Goal on Rural Resilience or Rural Renaissance. We strongly feel that indigenous peoples’ values and skills with respect to nature are crucial for human survival on our planet. Indigenous peoples have the right to be seen and heard, and the world needs to listen and learn from them. It is critical to include the wisdom of women, men and children from these communities in goal setting and achievement. A transparent, open and inclusive process with indigenous, rural and marginalised groups is therefore urgently needed to work out the concrete details.

Suggested areas to be focused on:

- Education:

Education systems need to be adapted to value and formally recognise experiential and indigenous wisdom, learning and knowledge. It is imperative that education systems be adapted to allow indigenous and rural people to maintain their cultural traditions and practices in harmony with their local environments. In developing and developed countries our world has become globally connected. Many local villages cannot function within the global village. Their cultures are being exterminated by the larger modern world. Many innovations carry a dilemma that requires more attention. Education, TV, media and digital facilities, for instance, can provide opportunities for better global cooperation to protect the diversity of indigenous cultures, or they can wipe it out.

- Economy:

Market forces and capitalism need to be mitigated to avoid that a modernist perspective from urban areas overwhelms and destroys what is of value in indigenous spaces. Ecological sustainability is enhanced by local production and consumption. Women, men and children need have the chance to be meaningfully included in making decisions that affect them and their localities. To allow this to be effective, capacity building and resource allocation need to be included into policy planning. People from businesses, NGOs and governments are called on to collaborate to build local capacities for people to voluntarily form entrepreneurial entities such as cooperatives, companies and NGOs without prohibitive costs or bureaucracy.

- Governance:

Most important is that governance in peripheral and rural regions is strengthened and capacity built so that indigenous and rural people are able to walk with two legs, we were told: One leg in modern society, and one leg in traditional, rural, indigenous societies with due respect for cultural aspects like minority languages, songs, stories, poetry, dress and

other customs. Rural regions are vulnerable when atomised as small villages and communities are therefore in real need of support to form networks, agglomerations of villages and other structures that allow autonomy and self-supporting ways of being in governance and in service provision.

On behalf of the international participants of the 12th Urban Culture Forum, titled Arts and Social Outreach - Designs for Urban Dignity, at Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, 3rd - 4th March 2014, and the 23rd Annual Conference of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network and the World Dignity University initiative, titled Returning Dignity, in Chiang Mai, Thailand, 8th-12th March 2014 Chiang Mai, Thailand, 14th March 2014, Sincerely, the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network (humiliationstudies.org) and World Dignity University initiative (worlddignityuniversity.org).

The goals of the Lazy School resonate with the Life University or Learning Institute For Everyone (LIFE) that Kjell Skjellstad shared on 11th March. The Inpang Community Network started out in 1987 with a group of village leaders in a number of villages in the Sakon Nakhon Province in Northeast Thailand:

In order to break the cycle of debt from cash-cropping, the farmers began to transform their farm landscapes from more costly, high-input, chemical dependent monocultures to diverse agroforestry systems that included rice for consumption as well as a wide variety of woody perennials. From a small group of twelve members, the Inpang network has grown to over 4000 members in five provinces in northeast Thailand, with linkages to many other farmer groups throughout Thailand. Inpang members grow hundreds of native woody perennial species as seedlings aimed at promoting the use of forest products from on-farm sources, rather than harvesting and collecting from the natural, protected forests in areas such as nearby Phuphan National Park (www.apn-gcr.org/resources/archive/files/4442bc808a35003c1838c6793d0b2692.pdf).

The Learning Institute For Everyone informs as follows:

These days it seems people all over the country are facing problems concerning debt, family, and their very own livelihood. It is as though their community is about to fall apart; people are unable to solve the myriad of problems they are besieged with. Despite the above situation, we have discovered that there exist a good number of people who have been able to solve their debt and other problems by themselves. We have also come across many communities that have not collapsed; on the contrary, they are strong and able to support themselves. More than just a few are outstanding to the point that many people from all over the country and from abroad have made an effort to pay them a study visit (www.life.ac.th).

To come back to the earlier mentioned Paulo Freire from Brazil, one of his insights is that we need to recognise that education is ideological (*ensinar exige reconhecer que a educação é ideológica*) (Freire, 1996). In this spirit, Freire quotes 18 statements which reflect what peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos from Recife, Brazil, calls communicative dignity:

The instances of communicative humiliation pointed out by Paulo Freire can also be considered violations of the human right to cognitive dignity. Here are two dehumanising statements, mentioned by Freire: *Você sabe com quem está falando?* (You can't talk to me

like that! Do you know who I am? (implicit: how important I am?) Você não precisa pensar. Vote em fulano, que pensa por você! (When you vote, you don't have to think. Vote for candidate X, who will think for you!)

Paulo Freire's examples are revealing of the types of communicative humiliation to which people may be subjected. Although some of the statements may be said to originate in Brazilian culture, they may also be found in other cultural contexts, since they convey dehumanising, offensive attitudes. In short, Freire's work is also precursory to what is now called Peace Linguistics (learning to communicate for the good of all Humankind) (Peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos, in a personal message to Noam Chomsky, shared with Evelin Lindner, 30th April 2013).

The Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS, www.humiliationstudies.org), of which I am the founding president, is a seedbed for a more dignified and dignifying global community (Lindner, Hartling, & Spalthoff, 2011). This effort has many aspects. For our annual conferences that we hold (since 2003), for instance, we have developed a *dignilogue* approach. We started out with the *open space* technology of Harrison Owen, 2009. Open space offers various roles to participants. The 'bumble-bees', for example, provide cross-pollination by moving from flower to flower, while those who remain in place guarantee the continuity and stability needed for the conversations to flourish. Both roles are important for a successful process.

Likewise, the world needs both, people who stay and people who move. To invite everybody into *global family building* means taking the best from sedentary life and merge it with global life designs. At the moment, unfortunately, there is a lack of the latter. At the current historical juncture of global crises, we need more bridge builders, people who work as 'unifiers of diversity'. I am a global bumble bee. I engage in the cultural diffusion of the unity-in-diversity principle, and I strive to manifest it in every aspect of my life. I have no base of my own. The planet is my home, and the human family is my family. Wherever I go, I search for three gifts: (1) a loving context in a family home (this is the most important aspect for me; I avoid hotels, since they alienate me into a 'guest role' while I want to be 'family;'; there is no need for me to 'be on my own' or 'undisturbed'), (2) a mattress (I work with my laptop on my knees, I avoid desks and chairs), (3) if possible, a reliable 24-hour online access (I am the web master of our HumanDHS website, and the nurturing of our work is done via email; I need to work through up to 250 emails per day; see more on www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin.php). We invite our HumanDHS network members to declare their homes to be Dialogue Homes and these homes are also my homes (see www.humiliationstudies.org/intervention/dialoguehome.php).

Sunflower identity is the name I coined for my personal global unity-in-diversity identity (Lindner, 2012b). Through my global life, the core of my identity (the core of the sunflower, so to speak) is anchored in our shared humanity, not just in theory but in practice, and more securely than any human identity ever had the opportunity before. The reason is that the technological tools to reach the limits of our globe are now more advanced than ever. And, as mentioned above, my experience has shown me that it is psychologically perfectly feasible to relate to all human beings as fellow family members and that most people are able to respond in kind.

At the periphery of my identity (the nested petals of the sunflower, so to speak), it is profoundly enriching to find safety in learning to 'swim' in the flux of diversity rather than to 'cling' to fixed positions. The mastery of movement provides a greater sense of security than fortress walls. Rather than seeking safety in one particular local culture, what fulfils me, is safety through the building of loving relationships globally. It is a pleasure to continuously pendulate in the spirit of nondualism, to have a *protean self* (Lifton, 1993) and to be a *voyager*

(Matsumoto, Yoo, & LeRoux, 2005). A voyager uses the challenge of cultural diversity and intercultural conflicts for forging new relationships and new ideas, while *vindicators* vindicate their pre-existing ethnocentrism and stereotypes.

I call for the field of *intercultural communication* to expand toward *global interhuman communication* and to ‘harvest’ those elements from all world cultures that foster relationships of loving mutuality and respect for equality in dignity—be it from the African philosophy of *Ubuntu* or indigenous knowledge about consensus building (Lindner, 2007). ‘Democracy’, as it stands now, is too rigid, easily fostering confrontation rather than cooperation, and this, in turn, undermines sustainable consensus building. There are many alternative cultural practices and concepts around that merit further exploration if we want to improve democratic practices—from *ho’oponopono*, to *musyawarah*, *silaturahmi*, *asal ngumpul*, *palaver*, *shir*, *jirga*, *minga*, *dugnad*, to *sociocracy*.

Creativity will be central to building a sustainable future for the bio- and sociosphere of our human family. Art is a field that fosters creativity and can help shift paradigms. My life design represents a creative experiment for a future world culture of truly shared humanity and equality in dignity. I am a nurturer of a global family where everybody is invited to become a collaborative leader. I do so in practice, not just in theory. My life could be called ‘a piece of social art’, an artistic experiment in serving humankind as a paradigm-shifting agent.

Wherever I go on the planet, I meet people of means, people with privileges, be it that they were born into a citizenship that provided them with a passport that offers easy access to the rest of the world, or be it that they enjoyed a higher education, or that they accumulated material wealth. Even the most well-intentioned people of means tend to believe that their reality is normality for the majority of everybody else. They may have a theoretical idea that other people live under dramatically different circumstances, yet, they do not truly realise it. The widespread belief in a *just world* causes people to blame the victim and this intensifies this disconnect. As I see it, this disconnect endangers the survival of humankind on our planet more than anything else. Those who have the means to bring about deep systemic change are not sufficiently motivated to do so, whereas those who have the motivation lack the resources. Both, motivation and resources are being wasted. The world is full of misinvested wealth on one side—charity may make things worse rather than better—and disappointed motivation on the other side. Since it is the powerful who have more influence to shape the world, their narrow perspective is mirrored in the overall short-sightedness with respect to how we humans arrange our affairs on our planet.

To remedy this situation, it is not sufficient for the wealthy to take regular vacations in extensions of their own bubbles elsewhere on the planet, however far away. Traveling to the Cambodian killing fields to play golf on the nearby golf course does little to elicit deeper understanding. What is important particularly for those with access to resources, in my view, is to make an effort, at least once in one’s life time, to seriously look beyond one’s own bubble of living. Any school, any higher education institution, ought to have in their curriculum an adaptation of *Blood, Sweat and T-shirts*, a TV documentary series broadcast in 2008. Young British consumers aged between 20 and 24 lived and worked alongside Indian garment workers making clothes destined for sale in British high-street stores. The series was followed by *Blood, Sweat and Takeaways* in 2009, which addressed the food production in Asia, and *Blood, Sweat and Luxuries* in 2010, which targeted the production of luxury goods in Africa.

As mentioned earlier, the *contact hypothesis*, or the hope that mere contact will foster friendship, is not necessarily warranted. Contact can also create enmity. The aim of *global citizenship of dignity and care* would be more modest, namely to transcend the self-righteousness that emanates from isolation and to create the first step to global dignity and care, namely humility.

What is needed?

My question: Why is Thailand so willingly selling out its soul and its resources to unsustainable global strategies? Thailand has never been colonised, why now? I urge Thailand to draw on the wisdom of their traditional communities, and to lead the world toward a dignified and dignifying future. Today's local challenges are embedded into global systemic frameworks of humiliation and only a coordinated effort by the world community can solve this problem. Let your wise elders such as Joni Odochaw speak to the entire world. People like him are the most valuable resource that Thailand possesses, and the world is in need of this resource, in dire need to listen to voices of wisdom.

Whoever wishes to become a global citizen like me has to nurture a considerable amount of courage and curiosity. The radical realism of idealism is not for cowards. One needs to be able to stand in awe and wonderment before our world. One has to leave the Western shopping-mall Kindergarten bubble behind and discover the immense creativity and diversity to be found in the so-called poor regions of our world, be it its indigenous populations or its favelas. One needs exceptional patience, integrity and authenticity, together with a great amount of dignified humility. One needs to radically walk one's talk, while seeking safety in 'swimming' in the flow of life rather than 'clinging' to illusionary fixities. One needs to strive for a degree of humiliation awareness that is unprecedented, since misunderstandings can cause deep wounds of humiliation, and misunderstandings are much more likely to occur when people from different cultural backgrounds meet than when people with homogenous backgrounds get together: 'I clearly show you my respect!' may be easily misunderstood as 'He clearly shows me his disrespect!'

Last but not least, one needs neither hope nor optimism. What is needed is love. Not love merely as a feeling, but love as a decision, as a choice to always keep stretching out one's hand prepared for loving mutuality. As in Martin Nowak's notion of *supercooperators* (Nowak & Highfield, 2011), as in Gandhi's notion of *satyāgraha*, a term that is assembled from *agraha* (firmness/force) and *satya* (truth-love) (Lindner, 2010).

Here is an important human weakness to be aware of as we walk: I call it our human inclination for *voluntary self-humiliation* (Lindner, 2009a, chapter 8). Political scientist Robert Jervis explains how 'over the past decade or so, psychologists and political psychologists have come to see ... that a sharp separation between cognition and affect is impossible and that a person who embodied pure rationality, undisturbed by emotion, would be a monster if she were not an impossibility' (Jervis, 2006, p. 643). Beliefs can be understood as feelings, as lived and embodied meaning (John Cromby, 2012). Here is the weakness that can trap us: Beliefs serve two goals, first, our reality testing and understanding of the world, and, second, our psychological and social need to live with ourselves and others. The problem here is that both can end up opposing each other, and this can lead to disastrous consequences. Our emotional desire for belonging and recognition may cause us to neglect responsible reality testing. For the sake of belonging, we may be satisfied with loose observations and superficial opinions and turn them into the firm justifications and staunch beliefs that our peers hold, as mistaken as they may be. We may create unnecessary conflicts, even catastrophic conflicts, while leaving necessary problems unaddressed. A glaring example for the potency of this trap, and why it is so important to be aware of it, is Thailand's neighbour Cambodia. Nicos Poulantzas (1936-1979), a Greco-French political sociologist in Paris, was one of Pol Pot's teachers. He was horrified when he saw what he had set in motion. He was so dismayed that he committed suicide (personal communication with Kevin Clements, August 21, 2007). Pol Pot had turned Poulantzas' academic reflections into rigid

ideology, ruthlessly implementing it in Cambodia, and in that way he created immense unnecessary suffering.

Radically new approaches to learning, the making of meaning and knowledge are required. The founder of the field of peace education, Betty Reardon, would have loved speaking with Joni Odochaw. These are her words: ‘What we do know, we do not know in a way that serves our needs. So, we need to know in different ways, and we need to build new knowledge through new ways of knowing. The new knowledge is in the area of designing new realities, which is likely to be done by speculative and creative thinking that would be communally shared and reflected for common formulation that would be tested in a continual process of social invention’ (Betty Reardon in a personal conversation, 6th July 2010, Melbu, Norway).

The world is the best university, the best arena for new approaches to meaning making. The reason is that ‘disorienting dilemmas’ are prime opportunities for learning: they unsettle fundamental beliefs and values and bring about transformation (Mezirow, 1991). Meeting people with different cultural backgrounds introduces such disorienting dilemmas. I sometimes choose to offer disorienting dilemmas from my side. I do that, for example, when I reply to the question ‘Where are you from?’ by saying ‘I am a member of our human family, like you—I am from planet Earth, with all its diversity, which I cherish’ (or something in this line). I introduce disorienting dilemmas to promote a new global dignity culture, and also the launch of the World Dignity University initiative answers this call.

I admit that it is not easy to become comfortable in the constant flow of Matsumoto’s practice of being a voyager. It is a complex task to continuously balance unity in diversity, with unity encompassing all of humankind and its ecosphere. Yes, it is extremely fulfilling, and it heeds the window of opportunity that we, the human family, are being offered by history. A sense of inner coherence, belonging and meaning can be achieved by finding the level of fixity for which one has the emotional and intellectual resources and then stretching it.

As a trained medical doctor and psychologist, I see that the Western approach to healing is limited; focusing on the removal of symptoms is not enough (Lindner, 2000, Lindner, 2006). I work for prevention, for the healing of humankind’s predicament through a transition toward meaning, synergy and balance, self-reflexive and self-reflective process, connectedness, wholeness and sharing.

I invest every minute of my life in nurturing a global movement of citizens who aim to build global institutional frameworks that end practices of humiliation and enable equality in dignity to flourish globally, which, in turn, will make it possible for local frameworks of equal dignity to thrive also. As reported earlier, so far, I observe that even the noblest local initiative falters after a while, namely, when it collides with global pressures.

My forty years of global experience show me that my vision of a future world culture of dignity is feasible. I can attest from personal hands-on practice that it is possible to overcome what divides us, and that we can side-step what forces us into uniformity. We can define ourselves as members of one single human family, a family who shares responsibility for our home planet with all its cultural and biological diversity.

I suggest that we all can benefit from trying global citizenship of dignity and care, be it by means of geographical or virtual travel. Theorist Kurt Lewin famously said that ‘There is nothing so practical as a good theory’. After forty years of global experience, I suggest to complement this insight with another one: ‘There is nothing so enlightening as a good practice’.

Reference List

- Allport, Gordon Willard (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Alperovitz, Gar (2009). *The Long Term Norm of the Economy Is Great Instability and High Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Presencing Institute, tc.presencing.com/sites/default/files/Interview_Alperovitz_0.pdf.
- Andersson, Gavin (2013). *Unbounded Organization: Embracing the Societal Enterprise*. Pretoria: University of South Africa Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2010). *44 letters from the liquid modern world*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Belenky, Mary Field, Bond, Lynne A., and Weinstock, Jacqueline S. (1997). *A Tradition That Has No Name: Nurturing the Development of People, Families, and Communities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berry, John W. (2013). Research on Multiculturalism in Canada. In *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Special Issue on Multiculturalism* In press.
- Berry, John W., Phinney, Jean S., Sam, David Lackland, and Vedder, Paul (Eds.) (2006). *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity and Adaptation Across National Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Coleman, Peter T. (2000). Power and Conflict. In Deutsch, Morton and Coleman, Peter T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*. (pp. 108-130) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Coleman, Peter T., Bui-Wrzosinska, Lan, and Nowak, Andrzej (2008). *Toward a Dynamical Model of Power and Conflict*. Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the 21st Annual Conference of the International Association of Conflict Management, July, 2008, www.tc.columbia.edu/i/a/document/9112_Toward.pdf.
- Cromby, John (2012). Beyond Belief. *Journal of Health Psychology*, published online 4 September 2012, 0 (0), pp. 1-15, doi: 10.1177/1359105312448866.
- Dahle, Maria (2008). *Human Rights Defenders - Do They Make a Difference?* Oslo, Norway: Presentation given at the Seminar "60th Anniversary of the Human Rights," at the Oslo Center for Peace and Human Rights, 24th November 2008, www.oslocenter.no/en/2008/11/seminar-60th-anniversary-of-the-human-rights/, published at Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/DahleUN60years24Nov2008.pdf.
- Dahle, Maria (2011). *Introduction to Working Session 3*. Warsaw, Poland: Introduction given on 27th September 2011 at the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting 2011, organised by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), 26th September-7th October 2011, www.osce.org/event/hdim_2011, published at Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/DahleOSCE27Sep2011.pdf.
- Eisler, Riane Tennenhaus (1987). *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future*. London: Unwin Hyman.

- Elias, Norbert (1991). Changes in the We-I Balance. *The Society of Individuals*. Oxford: Blackwell, translated from the German original *Die Gesellschaft der Individuen*, 1939.
- Fiske, Alan Page (1991). *Structures of Social Life: The Four Elementary Forms of Human Relations - Communal Sharing, Authority Ranking, Equality Matching, Market Pricing*. New York: Free Press.
- Fleras, Augie (2009). *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Multicultural Governance in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freire, Paulo (1968). *Educação e Conscientização: Extencionismo Rural*. Cuernavaca, México: CIDOC/Cuaderno, no. 25.
- Freire, Paulo (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, Paulo (1996). *Pedagogia Da Autonomia - Saberes Necessários à Prática Educativa*. São Paulo, Brazil: Paz e Terra, www.lettras.ufmg.br/espanhol/pdf%5Cpedagogia_da_autonomia_-_paulofreire.pdf.
- Gergen, Kenneth J., Gulerce, Aydan, Lock, Andrew, and Misra, Girishwar (1996). Psychological Science in Cultural Context. In *American Psychologist*, 51 (5), pp. 496-503, doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.51.5.496.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1973). *Erkenntnis Und Interesse: Mit Einem Neuen Nachwort*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp.
- Hardin, Garrett James (1968). The Tragedy of the Commons. In *Science*, 162, pp. 1243-1248.
- Hartling, Linda M. and Luchetta, Tracy (1999). Humiliation: Assessing the Impact of Derision, Degradation, and Debasement. In *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 19 (5), pp. 259-278.
- Herz, John H. (1950). Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. In *World Politics*, II, pp. 157-180.
- Hessel, Stéphane (2010). *Indignez-Vous!* Montpellier, France: Indigène éditions.
- Jervis, Robert (2006). Understanding Beliefs. In *Political Psychology*, 27 (5), pp. 641-663.
- Kahneman, Daniel (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Lee, Benjamin (1995). Critical Internationalism. In *Public Culture*, 7 (3), pp. 559-592.
- Lifton, Robert Jay (1993). *The Protean Self: Human Resilience in the Age of Fragmentation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2000). *The Psychology of Humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler's Germany*. Oslo, Norway: University of Oslo, Department of Psychology, doctoral dissertation in psychology.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006). *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International, Greenwood.

- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2007). Avoiding Humiliation - From Intercultural Communication to Global Interhuman Communication. In *Journal of Intercultural Communication, SIETAR Japan*, 10, pp. 21-38.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2009a). *Emotion and Conflict: How Human Rights Can Dignify Emotion and Help Us Wage Good Conflict*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2009b). Why There Can Be No Conflict Resolution As Long As People Are Being Humiliated. In *International Review of Education*, 55 (May 2-3, Special Issue on Education for Reconciliation and Conflict Resolution), pp. 157-184, doi: 10.1007/s11159-008-9125-9, published OnlineFirst December 27, 2008, at www.springerlink.com/content/bg5g32x832152953/?p=61dc6cf755b1443c83e89d49221b3e7a&pi=1, including the short version of Finn Tschudi's response and Evelin Lindner's rejoinder; long version at humiliationstudies.org/documents/evelin/ReconciliationforBirgitFinnEvelinlonginterview.pdf.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2010). *Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security: Dignifying Relationships From Love, Sex, and Parenthood to World Affairs*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, ABC-CLIO.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2012a). *A Dignity Economy: Creating an Economy Which Serves Human Dignity and Preserves Our Planet*. Lake Oswego, OR: World Dignity University Press.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2012b). Fostering Global Citizenship. In Deutsch, Morton and Coleman, Peter T. (Eds.), *The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace*. (pp. 283-298) New York: Springer.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda, Hartling, Linda M., and Spalthoff, Ulrich (2011). Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies: A Global Network Advancing Dignity Through Dialogue. In *Policy Futures in Education*, 9 (1, Special Issue: The Council of Europe's *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue*), pp. 66-73, www.worldwords.co.uk/PFIE.
- Lowman, Rodney L. (2013). *Internationalizing Multiculturalism: Expanding Professional Competencies in a Globalized World*. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Malikhao, Patchanee (2011). *Sex in the Village: Culture, Religion and HIV/AIDS in Thailand*. Penang, Malaysia, Chiang Mai, Thailand: Southbound and Silkworm Publishers.
- Margalit, Avishai (1996). *The Decent Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marshall, Graham R. (2008). Nesting, Subsidiarity, and Community-Based Environmental Governance Beyond the Local Level. In *International Journal of the Commons*, 2 (1), pp. 75-97, www.thecommonsjournal.org.
- Matsumoto, David Ricky, Yoo, Hee Seung, and LeRoux, Jeffery A. (2005). Emotion and Intercultural Communication. In Kotthoff, Helga and Spencer-Oatley, Helen (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics, Volume 7: Intercultural Communication*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Mezirow, Jack (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, William Ian (1993). *Humiliation and Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Naess, Arne (1978). Through Spinoza to Mahayana Buddhism or Through Mahayana Buddhism to Spinoza? In Wetlesen, Jon (Ed.), *Spinoza's Philosophy of Man: Proceedings of the Scandinavian Spinoza Symposium 1977*. Oslo, Norway: University of Oslo Press.
- Nagel, Thomas (1986). *The View From Nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nowak, Martin and Highfield, Roger (2011). *SuperCooperators: Altruism, Evolution, and Why We Need Each Other to Succeed*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. and Sen, Amartya Kumar (1993). *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press of Oxford University Press.
- Owen, Harrison (2009). *The Practice of Peace*. Circle Pines, MN: Human Systems Dynamics Institute.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Tropp, Linda R. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90 (5), pp. 751-783.
- Raskin, Paul D. (2012). Scenes From the Great Transition. In *Solutions for a Sustainable and Desirable Future*, 3 (4), pp. 11-17, www.thesolutionsjournal.com/node/1140.
- Ritzer, George (1993). *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rothkopf, David J. (2008). *Superclass: The Global Power Elite and the World They Are Making*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Sen, Amartya Kumar (1985). *Commodities and Capabilities*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Sen, Amartya Kumar (1999). *Development As Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, Amartya Kumar (2006). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. London: Allan Lane.
- Sundararajan, Louise (2012). *Indigenous Psychology: Grounding Science in Culture, Why and How? Anthropology in China*, www.cnanthropology.com/portal.php?mod=view&aid=380.
- Türken, Salman and Rudmin, Floyd Webster (2013). On Psychological Effects of Globalization: Development of a Scale of Global Identity. In *Psychology and Society*, 5 (2), pp. 63-89.